

REMARKS

This Submission is being filed along with a "Request for Continued Examination (RCE)" under 37 C.F.R. §1.114. This Submission is responsive to both the December 23, 2004 Final Office Action and to the March 9, 2005

5 Advisory Action.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 38-62 are pending, of which claims 38 and 45-51 have been amended.

10 **35 U.S.C. §102 Claim Rejections**

Claims 38-40, 42, 45, 51-53, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,995,774 to Applegate et al. (hereinafter, "Applegate") (*Office Action* p.2). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

15

Claim 38 recites a method for use by a component return entity, the method comprising "receiving a component of a printing device that has been utilized within the printing device and subsequently removed from the printing device, the component including a memory component that maintains printing-related data", "retrieving the printing-related data from the memory component after the memory component has been removed from the printing device and returned to the component return entity", and "utilizing the printing-related data for printing analysis". Support for the amendment to claim 38 can be found at least at page 2, line 26 to page 3, line 2; page 7, line 25 to page 8, line

20

25 14; and at page 15 lines 16-19 of the subject application.

Applegate does not show or disclose retrieving the printing-related data from the memory component after the memory component has been removed

from the printing device and returned to a component return entity, as recited in claim 38. Instead, Applegate describes a toner cartridge that includes a memory component which is used in a printing device, is removed from the printing device, and then reinserted into the printing device. After reinsertion
 5 of the toner cartridge, the printing device reads data from the reinserted component to determine if a printing operation should be allowed using the reinserted toner cartridge (because the life cycle of a non-reusable cartridge can be limited to a single load of toner material) (*Applegate* col.6, line 10 to col.7, line 2). There is nothing described in the cited sections of Applegate about
 10 retrieving printing-related data from the memory component after the memory component has been removed from the printing device and returned to a component return entity that receives the component, as recited in claim 38.

Applegate also does not show or disclose “utilizing the printing-related data for printing analysis”, as recited in claim 38. Applegate states that the
 15 printer makes decisions about the use of a cartridge based on the measured quantity of toner (*Applegate* col.28, lines 18-20). This teaches away from Applicant’s claim 38 which recites that the memory component has been removed from the printing device and returned to a component return entity. Applegate does not teach utilizing the printing-related data for printing analysis
 20 after the memory component has been removed from the printing device and returned to the component return entity, as recited in claim 38.

Accordingly, claim 38 is allowable over Applegate for at least these reasons and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

25

Claims 39-40, 42, and 45 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 38. Additionally, some or all of claims 39-40, 42, and 45 are allowable over Applegate for independent reasons. For example:

Claim 45 recites that “the printing-related data includes print media
5 usage data collected when the printing device is operational and when an imaging medium is printed on the print media”. Applegate does not show or disclose print media usage data pertaining to print media that has an imaging medium printed thereon, as recited in claim 45. The Office cites Applegate for a memory device that is updated to indicate a toner level (*Office Action* p.3;
10 *Applegate* col.6, lines 10-26). Applegate only discusses toner material (such as the “imaging medium” recited in claim 45) – there is no indication of print media usage in the cited section of Applegate. Accordingly, claim 45 is allowable over Applegate and the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

15 Claim 51 recites a method comprising “receiving a replaceable printing component that has been utilized within a printing device and subsequently removed from the printing device, the replaceable printing component having print media usage data maintained therewith, the print media usage data being collected during one or more printing operations when an imaging medium is
20 applied to print media”, “retrieving the print media usage data from the replaceable printing component after the replaceable printing component has been removed from the printing device”, and “utilizing the print media usage data for printing analysis”. Support for the amendment to claim 51 can be found at least at page 5, line 24 to page 6, line 7.

25 The amendment to claim 51 clarifies that “print media” does not include toner or ink as the Office contends (*Advisory Action*, p.2). Rather, an imaging medium is applied to the “print media” during printing, as recited in claim 51.

Print media is described at least on page 5, lines 25-27 of the subject application as being paper, plastic, fabric, and the like.

The Office rejects claim 51 along with claim 38 (for the same reasoning) (*Office Action* p.2). However claim 51 recites different feature(s) than those
 5 recited in claim 38. Applegate does not show or disclose print media usage data, as recited in claim 51. Further, the Office cites to sections of Applegate that describe a memory device which is updated to indicate a toner level (*Office Action* p.2; *Applegate* col.6, lines 10-26; col.6, line 57 to col.7, line 2; col.28, lines 8-21). However, as made clear by the amendment to claim 51, the “print
 10 media” of Applicant’s claim 51 is not “toner”. Therefore, the toner level data of Applegate does not show or disclose the print media usage as recited in Applicant’s claim 51.

As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 38, Applegate also does not show or disclose retrieving such print media usage
 15 data from the replaceable printing component after the replaceable printing component has been removed from the printing device, as recited in claim 51.

Applegate also does not show or disclose “utilizing the print media usage data for printing analysis”, as recited in claim 51. Applegate states that the printer makes decisions about the use of a cartridge based on the measured
 20 quantity of toner (*Applegate* col.28, lines 18-20). This teaches away from Applicant’s claim 51 which recites that the replaceable printing component has been removed from the printing device. Applegate does not teach utilizing the print media usage data for printing analysis after the replaceable printing component is removed from the printing device, as recited in claim 51.

25 Accordingly, claim 51 is allowable over Applegate for at least these reasons and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 52-53 and 55 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 51. Additionally, some or all of claims 52-53 and 55 are allowable over Applegate for independent reasons.

5

35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections

Claims 41, 54, and 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Applegate in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,219 to Ito et al. (hereinafter "Ito") (*Office Action* p.4). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

10

Claims 43-44 and 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Applegate in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,039,430 to Helterline (hereinafter, "Helterline") (*Office Action* p.6). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

15

Claims 46-50 and 58-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Applegate in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,097,497 to McGraw (hereinafter, "McGraw") (*Office Action* p.7). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

20

Claim 41 is allowable by virtue of its dependency upon claim 38 which is allowable over Applegate for at least the reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 38. Claim 41 is also allowable over the Applegate-Ito combination because Ito does not address the deficiencies of Applegate as described above in the response to the rejection of claim 38.

25

Claims 54 and 61-62 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 51 which is allowable over Applegate for at least the reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 51. Claims 54 and 61-62 are

also allowable over the Applegate-Ito combination because Ito does not address the deficiencies of Applegate as described above in the response to the rejection of claim 51. Additionally, some or all of claims 54 and 61-62 are allowable over the Applegate-Ito combination for independent reasons. For example:

Claim 61 recites that “a manufacturer of the replaceable printing component receives the replaceable printing component and retrieves the print media usage data”, and Claim 62 recites “providing the print media usage data to a manufacturer of the replaceable printing component”.

Ito does not teach or suggest that a manufacturer retrieves the print media usage data, as recited in claim 61, or that print media usage data is provided to a manufacturer, as recited in claim 62. Ito only describes recycling a toner cartridge if such cartridge is operable and loading the cartridge with toner (*Ito* col.15, lines 10-16). There is no discussion in Ito that teaches retrieving print media usage data, as recited in claim 61, or that print media usage data is provided to a manufacturer, as recited in claim 62.

Accordingly, claims 61 and 62 are allowable over the Applegate-Ito combination for at least these additional reasons and the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

20

Claims 43-44 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 38 which is allowable over Applegate for at least the reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 38. Claims 43-44 are also allowable over the Applegate-Helterline combination because Helterline does not address the deficiencies of Applegate as described above in the response to the rejection of claim 38.

5 Claims 56-57 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 51 which is allowable over Applegate for at least the reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 51. Claims 56-57 are also allowable over the Applegate-Helterline combination because Helterline does not address the deficiencies of Applegate as described above in the response to the rejection of claim 51.

10 Claims 46-50 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 38 which is allowable over Applegate for at least the reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 38. Claims 46-50 are also allowable over the Applegate-McGraw combination because McGraw does not address the deficiencies of Applegate as described above in the response to the rejection of claim 38. Additionally, some or all of claims 46-50 are allowable over the Applegate-McGraw combination for independent reasons. For
15 example:

Claims 46-50 recite “print media having an imaging medium printed thereon”. Support for the amendment can be found at least at page 5, lines 24-27 and at page 12, lines 4-12 of the application.

20 Claim 48 recites that “the printing-related data includes a total number of a brand of print media having an imaging medium printed thereon when routed in the printing device.” Neither Applegate nor McGraw disclose or suggest printing related data which includes a total number of a brand of print media routed in the printing device. McGraw describes determining what type of print media (e.g., plain paper, coated paper, glossy paper and film) is being
25 used in a printer, but does not describe determining the brand (*McGraw*, col.4, lines 14-18).

Claims 58-60 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 51 which is allowable over Applegate for at least the reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 51. Claims 58-60 are also allowable over the Applegate-McGraw combination because McGraw does not address
5 the deficiencies of Applegate as described above in the response to the rejection of claim 51. Additionally, some or all of claims 58-60 are allowable over the Applegate-McGraw combination for independent reasons. For example:

Claim 60 recites that “the print media usage data includes a total number
10 of a brand of print media routed during one or more printing operations.” Neither Applegate nor McGraw disclose or suggest printing related data which includes a total number of a brand of print media routed during one or more printing operations. McGraw describes determining what type of print media (e.g., plain paper, coated paper, glossy paper and film) is being used in a
15 printer, but does not describe determining the brand (*McGraw*, col.4, lines 14-18).

Conclusion

Pending claims 38-62 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is
5 urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: April 21, 2005

By: 

David A. Morasch
Reg. No. 42,905
(509) 324-9256 x 210

10